arXiv:1612.06712v2 [physics.gen-ph] 27 Dec 2016

Quantum Correction for Newton's Law of Motion

T.F. Kamalov

Theoretical Physics Department, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology
Institute str., 9, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region, 141700, Russia
E-mail: timkamalov@gmail.com

Abstract

Contemporary physics, both Classical and Quantum, requires a notion of inertial reference frames. However, how to find a physical inertial frame in reality where there always exist random weak forces? We suggest a description of the motion in non-inertial frames by means of inclusion of higher time derivatives. They may play a role of non-local hidden variables in a more general description complementing both classical and quantum mechanics.

Keywords: quantum correction, correction Newton Laws
PACS 03.65.Ud, 05.45.Mt

1 Introduction

The problem of physics axiomatization being one of Hilbert problems entails a search for unified axiomatic of both classical and quantum physics. In this paper the problem of incompleteness of quantum-mechanical description of the physical reality shall be replaced with the problem of incompleteness of classical physics. The implementation of the search for a unified axiomatics of classical and quantum physics is suggested through complementing classical physics as well. This is related to the fact that quantum physics is much richer in variables than classical one, and complementing classical physics with hidden variables is more reasonable than doing it with quantum physics, which has been practiced for the last 100 years by numerous authors in the effort to sew together classical and quantum physics.

2 Can Classical Description of Physical Reality be Considered Complete?

Quantum non-locality and quantum correlations are experimentally observable phenomena of quantum physics. At the same time, these experimental facts of quantum experiments have no explanation in classical physics and contradict in the some cases to its axiomatics. Should we consider physics not a unified consistent science, but rather, regard classical and quantum physics distinct, independent and unlinked sciences, then there would be no problem. But actually this is not the case. Physics must be a unified science, with classical physics describing macroscopic objects and quantum physics, microscopic ones. And depending on the situation we apply either former or latter ones. So their non-contradiction is required for consistency, and vice versa.

Non-consistency of classical and quantum mechanics axiomatics, on the one hand, and failure of the search for satisfactory quantum axiomatic, along with the refusal to over haul classical physics axiomatic, on the other hand, is one of the paramount challenges nowadays.

A most successful solution in providing physics consistency would be a unified axiomatics of the unified physics underlying both classical and quantum physics. The search for such an axiomatics was for the last century being carried out through the search of suitable quantum axioms. Since 1935 the issue of completeness of the quantum-mechanical description of the reality has been one of the most extensively discussed in physics. Usually the classical axiomatics was considered completed. The psychological inhibition of the extension of classical axiomatics was proliferated by extensive evidence of Newton's and Einstein's fundamental studies validity. However, a problem of incompleteness of the classical description of the physical reality has never been raised. May we pose such a question? Is the classical description of the physical reality complete?

According to Godel's theorem, there exist provisions in any theory that cannot be proved within this theory. It can also be added that no theory is complete. Axioms of any theory are not to be proved, but rather, they are conjectured, so any system of axioms may be replaced with another one. Newton's laws pertain to such improvable provisions. And Classical Physics can be extended to other field of an application.

In short, Newton's laws postulate the description of mechanical system

dynamics with second order differential equations. Are there any cases of the reality description with higher order differential equations? The answer is positive, it is known that yes, but it is not Newtonian mechanics.

As an example of body dynamics description with higher order differential equations let us consider body dynamics in randomly Vibrating Reference Frames $Q = f(t, q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \dddot{q}, ..., q^{(n)})$

$$\begin{gathered} Q = \langle q(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2}[q(t+\tau) + q(t-\tau)] \\ T = t \end{gathered}$$

is a time interval for averaging.

The second example for Classical Physics extension is considering the Quantum Reference Frames.

Both Vibrating Reference Frames and Quantum Reference Frames let's name the Real Reference Frames.

Definition. Quantum Reference Frame is a Reference frames with the transformation of coordinates and time as

$$\begin{gathered} Q = \langle q(t) \rangle = \int\limits_{-\tau}^{+\tau} \psi^* q \psi dt \\ T = t \end{gathered}$$

Here

$$\psi = \psi_0 e^{i\frac{\Delta p \Delta q + \Delta E \Delta t}{\hbar}} = \psi_0 e^{i\frac{\frac{\Delta p}{\Delta t} - F}{\frac{\hbar}{\Delta q \Delta t}}} = \psi_0 e^{i\frac{f_0}{f_Q}} \tag{1}$$

is wave function with the inertial force f_0 depend of high-order derivatives coordinates on time and f_Q corresponds of inertial forces and constant force.

A Real Reference Frames is a method to describe influences of random fields onto both the particle to be described itself and to an observer. Changing from a Real Reference Frame to an inertial one makes a free particle to randomly oscillate correlating with other free particles oscillations. If we consider single frequency oscillations, then these vibrations look coherent. Inertial frames transformations are prescribed as Galilean transforms (in a relativistic case, Lorentz transforms). Transformations of Real Reference Frames differ from Galilean-Lorentz transforms by remainder terms in Taylor's expansion. Then free particles in Inertial Reference Frames shall be featured with uncertainty in coordinate and momentum, time and energy equal to remainder terms of Taylor expansion.

If a transformation of a Real Reference Frame to another one described as a Taylor expansion contains a remainder term with index N, then we may say that this free particle conserves its N-th order time derivative. Such free particle is described by N derivatives and conserves this state until interactions with other bodies (forces) perturb this state.

If such a particle interacts with other bodies (a force acts onto it), then the dynamics of such a particle is described by (N+1)-th order differential equations. In other words, an influence of a force adds one more derivative to the description of particle oscillations.

Considering a particle in an Inertial Reference Frame instead of Real ones, one shall either introduce inertial forces, that is, change from higher-derivative description to the description without higher derivatives, but with inertia forces, or take into account remainder terms of Taylor expansion.

Modern physics (both classical and quantum) is physics of Inertial Reference Frames. The case of a Non-Inertial Reference Frame usually comes down to introducing inertia forces into an Inertial Reference Frame. Application of inertia forces enables reducing problems of physical system dynamics in a Non-Inertial Reference Frame to those in an Inertial Reference Frame through artificial introduction of inertial forces or through application of the d'Alembert's principle. At the same time, an Inertial Reference Frame doesn't exist in reality, as any reference frame is always influenced by infinitesimal perturbing fields or forces. In the present study we suggest considering only Non-Inertial Reference Frames as real ones. We shall call such Non-Inertial Reference Frames as Real ones. Since the incipience of d'Alembert's principle and up to now realness of inertia forces is a debatable issue. We believe that the question of inertia forces realness may be reduced to the question of Inertial Reference Frame realness.

In view of the above, there is a question to be answered, how could be physical systems described in Non-Inertial Reference Frames without introduction of inertia forces? Commonly Reference Frames are called Inertial provided Newton's laws hold there; actually, Newton's laws constitute the axiomatics of Classical Physics. They postulate the description of physical systems behavior by second order differential equations. Abandonment of higher time derivatives of coordinates is related to the issue inertia forces in Inertial Reference Frames. So to answer the above question we have to consider a more general case of higher orders differential equations and to extension Classical Physics with a description employing higher time derivatives of coordinate.

Changing from Inertial Reference Frame to Non-Inertial ones without inertia forces introduction means changing from second-order differential equations description of physical systems to their description with higher-order differential equations. Abandonment from employing higher order time derivatives of coordinate in the classical Newtonian physics does not mean they do not exist. They do exist in certain problems. But this is not the Newtonian Physics.

Now, expanding the axiomatics of the Classical Physics for the case of description of physical systems in Real Reference Frame without inertia forces, let us consider employing higher order differential equations.

In the most general case, a transformation from the Real Reference Frame to another one can be expressed as an arbitrary function:

$$Q = q(\tau, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \dddot{q}, ..., q^{(n)})$$
$$T = t$$

Conversion of coordinates of a point particle between two Real Reference Frames provided τ is a time interval for averaging, shall be expressed as

$$Q = q(t) + \dot{q}(t)\tau + \Delta q(t),$$
$$\Delta q(t) = \sum_{k=2}^{n} (-1)^k \frac{1}{k!} \tau^k q^{(n)}(t)$$

same holds for momentum

$$P = p(t) + \dot{p}(t)\tau + \Delta p(t),$$
$$\Delta p(t) = \sum_{k=2}^{n} (-1)^k \frac{1}{k!} \tau^k p^{(n)}(t)$$

$$\langle P \rangle = \frac{1}{2}[p(t+\tau) + p(t-\tau)] \tag{2}$$

Here, $\Delta q(t)$, $\Delta p(t)$ are remainder terms of the Taylor expansion. The remainder terms $\Delta q(t)$, $\Delta p(t)$ in the randomly vibrating reference system may be interpreted as uncertainties of coordinate and momentum of a point particle in this reference system. In quantum mechanics, uncertainties of coordinate and momentum of a micro particle obey to the rule

$$\Delta q(t) \Delta p(t) \geq \hbar/2 \tag{3}$$

In the classical physics can be introduced an uncertainty relation, as there always exist random small fields and forces influencing either the very system to be described or an observer, that is

$$[\sum_{k=2}^{n}(-1)^k\frac{1}{k!}\tau^k x^{(k)}(t)][\sum_{k=2}^{n}(-1)^k\frac{1}{k!}\tau^k p^{(k)}(t)] \geq H/2$$

inertial one.

The supremum of the difference of the action function in vibrating reference systems (with higher time derivatives of the generalized coordinate) from the classical mechanics action functions (without higher derivatives) is: In this case, higher derivatives are non-local additional variables and disclose the sense of the classical analog H of the Planck's constant. The H constant defines the supremum of the influence of random fields onto the physical system and the observer. We shall analyze this case in terms of vibrating reference systems. In this case, H defines the supremum of the difference between a real reference system and an

$$\sup\left|S(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q},\dddot{q},...,q^{(n)},...) - S(q,\dot{q})\right| = H. \tag{4}$$

Action functions in higher-derivative real reference systems describe physical systems dynamics and differ from the action function neglecting random fields, which are accounted for via vibrating reference frames. In our case, the classical space is featured by infinite number of variables, same as Hilbertian one. In the search for a unified axiomatics the classical constant H shall coincide with the quantum one, i.e. the Planck constant $\hbar$. In this approach, the estimate of the Planck constant may be determined by higher derivatives, playing the role of non-local hidden variables.

In this case the state of quantum object can be describe

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \left|q,\dot{q},\ddot{q},\dddot{q},...,q^{(n)}\right\rangle = |Q(t)\rangle\,.$$

The transfer object from point 1 to point 2 is

$$\langle Q_1,t_1|Q_2,t_2\rangle = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} DQ\exp(\tfrac{i}{\hbar}L(Q))dt.$$

And action function can be represent

$$A_{Q(R)} = \left\langle q(t),\dot{q}(t),\ddot{q}(t),...,q^{(n)}(t)|[i\hbar\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t} - H]|q(t),\dot{q}(t),\ddot{q}(t),...,q^{(n)}(t)\right\rangle dt$$

3 Quantum Correlations and Illusion of Superluminal Interaction

The discussing the non-locality of entangled states quantum correlations for observers Alice and Bob, we may notice the following. The emerging illusion of transfer from A to B, or interaction of entangled quantum objects in A and B follows from experimentally observed correlation of their states. So it would be correct to negate not only faster-than-light interaction or transfer, but the very fact of any interaction or transfer. Existence of quantum correlations and non-locality of micro-object quantum states may be describe by non-inertial nature of real (randomly oscillating) reference systems due to infinitesimal influences of various fields (gravitational, electromagnetic, and other). In other words, existence of quantum non-locality and quantum correlations means an illusion rather than realness of any transfer or faster-than-light interaction of these objects.

Let us perform an imaginary experiment of the classical analog of teleportation of quantum polarization states of bi-photons.

For this purpose, let us consider the classical analog of teleportation of bi-photon polarization states quantum entanglement. A classical analog of this situation may be considered on the example of newspapers with news printed, say, in the city O and sent to cities A and B.

If a reader in the city A reads the news, then coincidence of his/her information with that in B may be described with a non-zero correlation factor. This is so because the news information in A and B shall correlate with a non-zero factor.

Let us emphasize that the complete match of the news information could only occur provided readers A and B read newspapers with the same title and of the same date.

If the newspapers are different but both of the same date, then the correlation factor will not be unity, but at the same time, it will not be zero. To achieve complete match of the news information with the correlation factor unity, the reader A shall advise to the reader B both the title of the newspaper and its date.

To provide teleportation of bi-photon quantum states from A to B we may consider a primary photon, which, with the aid of a non-linear crystal (e.g. BBO), is split in the point O into two photons with vertical H and horizontal V polarizations. Photon B may be compared with photon C,

entangled with photon D. Therefore, in points A and D measurements of polarizations of the photons shall always coincide.

Let us repeat the proof of the Bell's theorem incorporating influences of any random fields, waves, or forces onto both particles A and B and the observers. We consider here the reference system to be a vibrating one. We may consider that in the inertial reference system these particles are influenced with random inertia forces, which, due to the equivalence principle, can be described by a random metrics.

4 Quantum Correction of Second Newton Law

Ostrogradsky formalism uses Lagrange function is

$$L = L(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, ..., q^{(n)}, ...)$$

but not

$$L = L(q, \dot{q})$$

Euler-Lagrange equation in this case is follow from least action principal [1-5]

$$\delta S = \delta \int L(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \dddot{q}, ..., q^{(n)})dt = \int \sum_{n=0}^{N} (-1)^n \frac{d^n}{dt^n}(\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^{(n)}})\delta q^{(n)} dt = 0.$$

or

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial q} - \frac{d}{dt}\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}} + \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\frac{\partial L}{\partial \ddot{q}} - \frac{d^3}{dt^3}\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dddot{q}} + ... + (-1)^n \frac{d^n}{dt^n}\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^{(n)}} + ... = 0$$

This equation can be write in the form of corrected Newton Second Law of Motion in Randon Vibrating Reference Frames

$$F - ma + f_0 = 0$$

Here

$$f_0 = mw = w(t) + \dot{w}(t)\tau + \sum_{k=2}^{n} (-1)^k \frac{1}{k!}\tau^k w^{(n)}(t)$$

is a random inertial force (1) which can be represent by Taylor expansion with high-order derivatives coordinates on time

$$F - ma + \tau m\dot{a} - \frac{1}{2}\tau^2 ma^{(2)} + ... + \frac{1}{n!}(-1)^n \tau^n ma^{(n)} + ... = 0$$

In the Inertial Reference Frames $w = 0$.

5 Verifications of High-Order Derivatives as Non-Local Hidden Variables

The role of High-Order Derivatives as Hidden Variables can be verified by using the Equivalence Principal when acceleration is equal to gravitational field. Then the correlation factor for entangled photons polarization measurements may be presented as

$$|M| = |\langle AB\rangle| = \left|\left\langle(\lambda^i A^k g_{ik})(\lambda^m A^n g_{mn})\right\rangle\right| \tag{5}$$

Here, the random variables distribution function may be considered uniform, with the photon polarization varying from 0 to π:

$$\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int\limits_0^\pi \rho(\phi)d\phi = 1.$$

According to the definition,

$$\cos\phi = \tfrac{\lambda^i A^k g_{ik}}{\sqrt{\lambda^i\lambda_i}\sqrt{A^k A_k}},$$
$$\cos(\phi+\theta) = \tfrac{\lambda^n B^n g_{mn}}{\sqrt{\lambda^m\lambda_m}\sqrt{B^m B_n}}.$$

Hence, the correlation factor is

$$|M| = \left|\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int\limits_0^\pi \rho(\phi)\cos\phi cos(\phi+\theta)d\phi + \tfrac{1}{\pi}\int\limits_\pi^{2\pi}\rho(\phi)\cos\phi cos(\phi+\theta)d\phi\right| = |\cos\theta|\,.$$

The Bell's observable in our case differs from that calculated by Bell and does not contradict to experimental data. Bell's inequality are not violated in either classical or quantum cases of accounting for random fields, forces and waves.

.

6 Conclusion

Additional terms in the form of higher derivatives may play the role of hidden variables complementing both quantum and classic mechanics. Additional terms have non-local character, which enables their employment for description of nonlocal effects of quantum mechanics. The effect of quantum correlations and non-locality of quantum states can be explained by the random character of interactions if extended particles. Such an approach can be realized within the scope of Ostrogradsky higher derivatives formalism.

References

[1] M.V. Ostrogradsky. Memoires sur les equations differentielles relatives au probleme des isoperimetres. Mem. Acad. St. Petersburg 6 (4), 385 (1850).

[2] T.F. Kamalov, Classical and quantum-mechanical axioms with the higher time derivative formalism// Journal of Physics Conference Series, 442 (2013) 012051.

[3] T.F. Kamalov, Physics of non-Inertial Reference Frames// http://arxiv.org/abs/0708.1584v1.

[4] T.F. Kamalov, Axiomatization of Mechanics//Quantum Computers and Computing, v. 11 (2011) p. 52-57, http://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:1011.4256.

[5] Rami Ahmad El-Nabulsi, Non-Standard Non-Local-in-Time Lagrangians in Classical Mechanics, Qual. Theory Dyn. Syst. (2014) 13:149–160.